

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Docket Number (Optional)

S63.2-14157-US01

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

on September 29, 2008Signature /James M. Urzedowski/Typed or printed name James M. Urzedowski

Application Number

10/645653

Filed

8/20/2003

First Named Inventor

Freyman et al.

Art Unit

3736

Examiner

Catherine Witczak

Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.

This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.

The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s).

Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.

I am the

☐ applicant/inventor.
/James M. Urzedowski/

Signature

☐ assignee of record of the entire interest.
See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed.
(Form PTO/SB/96)
James M. Urzedowski

Typed or printed name

☒ attorney or agent of record.
Registration number 48596
952-563-3000

Telephone number

☐ attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34.
September 29, 2008

Date

Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34 _____

NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required.
Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below.

☐ *Total of _____ forms are submitted.

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Privacy Act Statement

The **Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579)** requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (i.e., GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

REASONS FOR PRE-APPEAL CONFERENCE

This paper is being filed in response to the Advisory Action dated August 20, 2008 and the Final Office Action dated May 28, 2008. The rejection of claims 25-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,713,853 to Clark et al. ("Clark") in view of U S Patent No. 6,364,856 to Ding et al. ("Ding") has been maintained.

Independent claim 25 of the present application is directed to a medical device having among other features a self-expanding delivery member "shaped in a continuous solid cylindrical configuration".

In rejecting the instant claim and those dependent therefrom, the Examiner cited Clark as disclosing all of the features of the instant claim, except for a delivery member being shaped in a continuously solid cylindrical configuration. The Examiner stated that it would be obvious to modify the device of Clark with a continuously solid delivery member (asserted by the Examiner to be disclosed by Ding) "since such a structure would ensure maximum contact with the treatment area when the delivery member is in its expanded state."

Applicants disagree with this rejection and the basis upon which the Examiner has relied on making it.

In the Clark reference the delivery member is in fact a plurality of delivery members 502 or with spaced ribs 702. The members or ribs of Clark are intended to allow the device to serve as a thrombolytic filter. The ribs can be solid or can define a series of ports or lumens (column 12, lines 61-65), but in any case they are configured to

allow blood to flow to tissue distal to the delivery site through the regions defined by the ribs (column 14, lines 38-40). If the device is modified to contain a delivery member with a continuous solid cylindrical configuration without gaps between ribs, it would no longer allow for blood to reach tissue distal the delivery site and would no longer perform act as a filter.

Thus, based on the above, while Clark certainly teaches away from any modification that would require the delivery member to be configured in the manner recited in the instant claims, it is also apparent that a modification forcing Clark to incorporate a delivery member having a continuous solid cylindrical configuration would interfere with the stated function of the Clark device. Simply put, one of ordinary skill in the art would not seek to structurally modify the filter of Clark in such a way that it is no longer capable of acting as a filter.

As stated in the Manual of Patent Examiner Procedure, "It is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination." MPEP, 8th Ed. Rev. 6 (Sep. 2007) § 2145(X)(D)(2); *see also KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1740 (2007); *Takeda Chem. Indus., Ltd. v. Alphapharm Pty. Ltd.*, 492 F.3d 1350, 1358-59 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (finding the prior art taught away from the claims and the claims therefore were not invalid). Clark clearly shows and describes multiple delivery members or ribs (see elements 502 and 706 for examples) which collectively act as a filter to allow blood to flow therethrough while catching or removing a thrombus or plaque (column 12, lines 61-65 & column 14, lines 39-43). The filter described in Clark is clearly distinct from the continuous solid cylindrical member of the present application in both structure and function; regardless of the teaching of Ding, one of ordinary skill

would not be motivated to modify such a filter in a manner that would render the filter incapable of functioning as such.

To that end, it must also be noted that MPEP § 2143.01 states "If [a] proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification." In the present case there is no doubt that the Examiner's proposed modification of Clark would render the described filter unsatisfactory for its intended purpose.

In light of the above, Applicants assert that it would not be obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Clark to contain a delivery member with a continuous solid cylindrical configuration such as instant claims 25 describes. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of independent claim 25 be reversed. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of dependent claims 26-40 likewise be reversed for at least the same reasons that the rejection of independent claim 25 should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

Date: September 29, 2008

By: /James M. Urzedowski/
James M. Urzedowski
Registration No.: 48596